

3-22-2004

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 22, 2004

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©2004 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 22, 2004" (2004). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 1001.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/1001

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

TO: senate-minutes <senate-minutes@uni.edu>, kotik55 <kotik55@uni.edu>, Emiliano Lerda <emiliano@uni.edu>, dena.snowden@uni.edu
FROM: **Melissa Heston** <melissa.heston@uni.edu>
DATE: Mon, 12 Apr 2004 18:33:30 -0500
SUBJECT: **Approved Senate Minutes for Mar. 22, 2004**

SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING 3/22/04

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Heston called the meeting to order at 3:15 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes as corrected; by Senator Zaman; second by Senator Chancey. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Terry Hudson, Waterloo-Cedar Falls Courier was present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST PODOLEFSKY

Provost Podolefsky stated that the Republican legislators announced their budget targets, which is a no growth, status quo budget for UNI and the other Regents institutions, with zero funding for employee salary increases, and will make permanent the 2.5% cut we took in October.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, CAROL COOPER

Dr. Cooper noted that Owen Newlin, as president of the Board of Regents, is stepping down the first of May, that Greg Nichols, Board of Regents Executive Director, will be speaking on Friday, April 9 at 1:00 P.M. in Maucker Union. She also noted the AAUP is holding a conference on academic freedom on campus Saturday, March 27, CBB 121.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR HESTON

Chair Heston had no comments.

ONGOING BUSINESS

Consideration of Motion to Eliminate Capstone as a University Requirement

Chair Heston reminded the Senate that this motion had been made by Senator O?Kane with the second coming from Senator vanWormer.

Senator O?Kane noted that his position has not changed; he is unconvinced that Capstone as it is currently proposed should be a requirement.

Senator Wormer stated that she seconded the motion because there is some pressure to eliminate hours from the Liberal Arts Core (LAC) and a very convenient place would be out of the Capstone requirement.

A lengthy discussion followed.

Senator Swan moved to call the question; second by Senator Romanin.
Motion passed with 11 voting yes, a two-thirds majority.

Motion to Eliminate Capstone as a University Requirement was defeated with five voting yes, nine voting no.

Consideration of Motion calling for further discussion of LAC proposals

This motion was made by Senator Swan at the end of the 3/08/04 meeting. He noted that by making this motion he was hoping to signal to the university community the degree of serious intensity of these proposals. Agendas are published so the university community knows when votes will be taken, when discussions will be. By passing this motion, we are saying that we are going to discuss the LACC proposals further at this meeting, but there will not be a vote. This motion, to discuss further the LACC proposals without voting on them, was seconded by Senator MacLin.

A lengthy discussion followed.

In light of the time constraints, Provost Podolefsky suggested we decide if and when we will actually discuss it and vote on it rather than just saying we will discuss it later.

Senator Swan responded that that is a very good suggestion and suggested the following friendly amendment, that the Senate continue discussing the LACC Proposals at the next meeting without voting on them. Senator MacLin who had seconded the motion agreed.

Further discussion followed.

Senator Wurtz moved to call the question; second by Senator Chancey.
Motion passed.

Motion calling for further discussion only at the April 12, 2004 Faculty Senate failed, with it remaining on the agenda for the April 12, 2004 as a possible action item pending discussion.

Motion to put further discussion of LACC Proposals on the agenda for the April 12, 2004 meeting for action after discussion by Senator Chancey; second by Senator Moore.

Senator Swan called for the orders of the day. Chair Heston responded that we will put this motion aside and return to it.

Consideration of Program Restatements

Associate Provost Koch stated that the next item for consideration is the final curriculum matter from the University Curriculum Committee (UCC). She reminded the Senate that the final curriculum package was sent to the Senate with a cover letter dated 3/11/04. This is the final step in the curriculum review process for the year and involves approval

of the program restatements only with a few additional items. The rest of the curriculum package has gone forward to the Board and these most recent changes are scheduled to be docketed for the April meeting.

Dr. Koch noted that eleven programs were reduced in length to become credit hour neutral, and they were approved as revised. They had all been longer prior to this revision. Three programs were revised and reduced, and nine programs that were tabled and then reconsidered and actually do have some increase in hours ranging to one to six hours.

Senator Swan moved to approve with gratitude this proposal from the UCC on Program Restatements; second by Senator MacLin.

Motion passed with one abstention.

Consideration of Additional Graduate Curriculum Changes

Associate Dean Jacqueline McGlade, Graduate College, passed out informational sheets on the changes and pending new programs, noting that information on the new M.A. can be obtained by going to the Graduate College website, with a link to the Graduate College Curriculum Committee (GCCC).

Senator Chancey moved approval of the additional graduate curriculum changes omitting the M.A. in Philanthropy and Non-Profit Development that will come to the Senate at a later meeting; second by Senator Zaman. Motion passed.

The Senate moved to Executive Session to discuss the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence nominees.

Motion to accept the recommendations of the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence Committee by Senator Romanin; second by Senator Ogbondah. Motion passed.

Resumption of discussion of Senator Chancey's motion asking for a vote at the April 12, 2004 meeting on the LACC Proposals.

Senator Chancey noted that his reason for making the motion is just a practical matter. To exercise our review process as the Senate we need to be clear to our university colleagues when we will take action. A lengthy discussion followed.

The motion by Dr. Cooper to extend the Senate meeting for ten minutes was passed with one opposed. Discussion followed.

The Provost recommended that the next meeting be extended for an hour, and if there is a motion and two-thirds feel so, vote on the question.

Senator Chancey clarified his motion, noting that it be listed as action on the agenda. Whatever the Senate wishes to do, whether it is to table it, to call the question, it is simply as a courtesy to our colleagues.

It was agreed to schedule the next meeting, April 12, for extra time and address this item only. It was suggested that refreshments be provided.

Senator Swan made a friendly amendment that the LACC Proposals be listed as an action item on the agenda and to extend the meeting by one hour to 6:00 P.M. This was agreed to by Senator Chancey.

Motion to call the question by Senator Swan; second by Senator Moore.
Motion passed.

Motion to dedicate an extended Senate meeting on Apr. 12 to discussion and possible action on the LAC proposal passed.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
3/22/04
1605

PRESENT: Ronnie Bankston, Karen Couch Breitbach, Clif Chancey, Carol Cooper, Cindy Herndon, Melissa Heston, Susan Koch, Otto MacLin, Susan Moore, Chris Ogbondah, Steve O'Kane, Aaron Podolefsky, Tom Romanin, Jesse Swan, Dharendra Vajpeyi, Katherine vanWormer, Susan Wurtz, Shah Varzavand, Donna Vinton, Mir Zaman

Maribelle Betterton was attending for David Christensen.

Absent: Gayle Pohl

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Heston called the meeting to order at 3:15 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes as corrected; by Senator Zaman; second by Senator Chancey. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

Terry Hudson, Waterloo-Cedar Falls Courier was present.

COMMENTS FROM PROVOST PODOLEFSKY

Provost Podolefsky stated that the Republican legislators announced their budget targets, which is a no growth, status quo budget for UNI and the other Regents institutions, with zero funding for employee salary increases. This will make permanent the 2.5% cut we took in October and we will receive no money to fund salaries. He noted, however, that salary increases will be funded which will reduce the operating budget.

The good news, he noted, is that this is exactly what he has planned in the spreadsheets that have been passed on to deans and the Academic

Affairs Council. We are prepared to take into account this scenario.

The Provost also noted that the legislature has passed approval to bond, which means they will pay those bonds. Had it been our choice we might rather have gotten operating expenses but it was not our choice. This allows legislators to say they did provide something for the Regents, and we will be pleased when buildings are renovated.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, CAROL COOPER

Dr. Cooper noted that Owen Newlin, as President of the Board of Regents, is stepping down the first of May and the Board is split over a replacement, with the ?swing? vote being the new student representative on the Board.

Dr. Cooper reminded the Senate that Greg Nichols, Board of Regents Executive Director, will be speaking on Friday, April 9 at 1:00 P.M. in Maucker Union.

She also noted the AAUP is holding a conference on academic freedom on campus Saturday, March 27, CBB 121.

COMMENT FROM CHAIR HESTON

Chair Heston had no comments.

ONGOING BUSINESS

Consideration of Motion to Eliminate Capstone as a University Requirement

Chair Heston reminded the senate that this motion had been made by Senator O?Kane with the second coming from Senator vanWormer.

Senator O?Kane noted that his position has not changed: he is unconvinced that Capstone as it is currently proposed should be a requirement.

Senator vanWormer stated that she seconded the motion because there is some pressure to eliminate hours from the Liberal Arts Core (LAC) and a very convenient place would be out of Capstone, keeping the environmental course but moving it out of Capstone. She noted that Capstone comes at the end of the curriculum, whereas the Social Sciences, especially Category C, come more at the beginning. If we retain Capstone we will be adding courses that are less appropriate for ending courses than for beginning courses. She feels it is more important to have the Category C courses, as they are the core of critical thinking, earlier than later in the curriculum.

Senator Herndon asked if voting against this is not a vote for something else. Chair Heston replied that passing this motion would eliminate Capstone as a university requirement. The LAC proposals are independent of action on this motion.

Senator MacLin asked Senator O?Kane if it is correct that his department, Biology, carries the major Capstone load. Senator O?Kane replied that that was true. Senator MacLin also asked if the Liberal

Arts Core Committee's (LACC) response clarified the issue. Senator O'Kane responded that it made him feel that if Capstone stayed he would be a bit happier with it. He was very pleased with the question and answer format of the FAQ sheet, and would like to see this information appear in the actual proposal, including those questions and answers that would significantly improve the proposal.

Senator Varzavand commented that it is unfortunate that the vote for elimination of Capstone comes from the College of Natural Science, specifically Biology. In the early 1990's Biology was allocated a couple of positions exclusively to teach Capstone.

The Provost responded that over the years there have been many positions allocated specifically for various sections of the LAC, and the early 1990's was when someone else was Provost and there was a different dean.

Senator Chancey stated that he agrees with Senator O'Kane in that the Biology Department carries the burden of Capstone. But putting it in perspective, the load that they carry as a percentage of their faculty is the same percentage as physics, which is a much smaller department. He noted that he agrees that we want to move forward with something that provides a bit more balance, taking some of the load off the Biology Department but provides a broadening of it. He will be voting against this proposal because, as the Faculty Senate representative on the LACC, he appreciates the need for something that is broader than our individual disciplines, as that is what employers look for. We do a wonderful job in our own disciplines but if we can't step back and provide a broadening experience, something we trust our colleagues within the university to provide, then we do need to provide it, in whatever form. And we need to support our colleagues who are willing to work toward this.

Senator MacLin remarked that he has been watching what has been going on among the various committees and such on these issues and we are all trying to do the right thing but it is not always clear. He sees a number of departments that have major investments in resources towards a specific outcome. He wonders if they are being self-serving, or should we look at them and think that they do know something. And instead of diminishing their remarks maybe we should say that they know what it is they are telling us and begin to lean towards their views. There will always be issues that come up that affect individual departments and colleges, and we need to get an idea of how we want to proceed and the process we want to take.

Senator Bankston noted that there are a number of issues coming into play here, there are resource issues, there are curricular issues, instructional quality issues, which come down to basically two issues. If Capstone can provide a true culminating experience with quality instruction in terms of having an engaging classroom experience taught by faculty not adjuncts to a diverse population across majors in the same classroom, it's wonderful, and the question is how we do this given resource issues. If we can't do that, then let's face the fact and move forward.

Senator Swan remarked that there seem to be further issues. The primary sponsor seems to want something like Capstone but out of Category III. The co-sponsor wants to drop two further hours from the LAC. In contemplating how to resolve this, we actually have two different interests at stake. The Senate may want to think about an amendment for clarity sake to the motion to drop Capstone from Category III so we can

have an opportunity to vote clearly on two different interests; to drop it from Category III and perhaps create its own category as the LACC has recommended, or to drop the whole two hours from the LAC. As it is now, we currently have two very different interests at work and it would be better if we could vote on them separately.

Senator Couch Breitbach recommended that the Senate vote the motion down because the ?waters have been muddied?; where would voting in favor of the motion leave us? She does not want our decision about Capstone to be influenced by looking at the hours. Our decision should be influenced by what we think is best for our students and for the LAC, what the purpose of Capstone is and how does keeping Capstone affect the overall purpose of the LAC. If we want to look at hours, let?s look at them as a separate issue. She feels Capstone should stay, Capstone should have a global perspective, should be a culminating, senior-level experience, and we should expand who is able to offer that experience, and we should not let budget influence that decision, only what is best for students.

Senator Chancey responded to Senator Bankston?s comments by saying he is optimistic about whether we can provide what he suggests only because the curriculum and anything we might do with Capstone rests with the abilities and intent of the faculty of this university. Given the faculty of this university, if they will it, it will take place.

Senator MacLin commented that he appreciates Senator Swan separating the two items with regards to the Capstone motion, but he sees it as Senator O?Kane?s motion, and it is a well defined motion, and the intent of the second does not comes into consideration. He noted that his exposure to Capstone has been the students who have taken it, are taking it, or have yet to take it. The Senate has not heard from any students on this issue and that would be good information for the Senate to have. Capstone ?should be? a culminating experience but he doesn?t see that happening. In terms of scrapping it and redeveloping it into something we think we should have, he supports Senator O?Kane.

Senator Chancey noted that as far as student opinion goes, the LACC has a student representative who is a voting member of that committee, and for the past year it has been Nate Green. The Capstone proposal that came forth from the LACC was moved by Nate Green. So, yes, the students have weighed in on this issue.

Senator Bankston noted that the LACC?s proposal for Capstone is a three-year experimental offering with an evaluation at the end of that time. How would we go about measuring or assessing the success or lack of success at the end of that three-year period?

Senator Varzavand commented that the issue of dropping or modifying Capstone has become so convoluted that it is not clear to him as to whether we are eliminating it or modifying it because of quality and resources issues. Which one of those issues has brought Capstone under the microscope to begin with? If the goal of dropping Capstone out of the LAC is to reduce the number of hours in the Core, what kind of purpose would that serve?

Chair Heston clarified that this motion is designed to eliminate Capstone outright from the LAC, it does not bar any future changes to the LAC related to Capstone.

Al Hayes, Director of Public Policy, stated that along with Alexandra

Kogl, Political Science, they are here today representing the American Democracy Project Committee, which has been considering ways to encourage higher levels of citizen engagement and involvement by students across the campus. In conversations they have had, making citizen participation a part of Capstone has been discussed as a possibility. This would be a way to encourage students to engage in the community as they move out of their college experience. For that reason, he is very reluctant to see Capstone ?chopped off at the knees? without the opportunity for people to offer experimental options. There is no doubt that the way it is run now is not satisfactory. We get so caught up in the poor way the principle is being implemented that we ignore that we do have something with a good principle and we need to change implementation. He would encourage experimentation, broadening and improvement of Capstone so the burden doesn't fall on individual departments. Some of the things the ADP Committee is considering could very well fit in within that spirit of experimentation.

Professor Kogl added that as a new faculty member, she has spoken with other new faculty members who have barely figured out what the LAC is and have a real interest in teaching a kind of Capstone but broadening the vision of what that would be. The plea is more for time for these experimental efforts to be developed. If we eliminate it now, would there be a possibility of reinvigorating some kind of Capstone or senior seminar in the future?

Dr. Jerry Smith, Dept. of Management and LACC member, noted that he is in support of Capstone on the grounds that it is one means by which this program has potential for identity among students and faculty. Looking at the different kinds of general education requirements or programs across different universities, there is a range from ?distribution requirement? type programs with no program identity to programs where the university is committed and the programs have real identity for the students and are held together by the faculty. Where Capstone has failed in the past, it has potential to give this program some identity. The Humanities courses do this; the Personal Wellness and Non-Western Cultures courses could do this. It is a mistake to throw it away; give it a three-year trial and then decide.

Linda Walsh, Psychology, added that she appreciates hearing from those that want to keep or modify Capstone, given that one of the major rationales for the proposal was to speed the way toward graduation and eliminate some of the bottlenecks that students encounter. It would be helpful to have more complete data on how many faculty would be in favor of teaching a Capstone course, and if all of them together could come close to serving the needs of all of our students in the LAC program. It may be that this would only be a small fraction of what is necessary. If we can't come close to serving the needs then we're not getting away from the problem that this proposal was put forth to solve.

Joe Gorton, Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology, commented that he is somewhat perplexed because it seems that what drives these proposals is the streamlining of the undergraduate program. At the same time, it seems there is a lot of ambivalence about the Capstone as it exists now. Why is it that at one time we want to streamline the students' program but at the same time maintain a requirement that we're ambivalent about in terms of how it operates? It seems that we essentially want to experiment on our students. We seem to be at a place where we're making real choices about our identity and purpose as a university, and these are very tough choices about the quality of our programs. If we're going to preserve the quality of our programs we

should act to eliminate those courses that are dubious in terms of their contribution.

Bev Kopper, LACC Chair, stated that it is important to know the history in terms of how the original model came about which was as a result of the Category III review. That was prior to the discussions related to the possibility of reducing the number of hours in the Core. The LACC was asked by the Faculty Senate to have that discussion as a whole and to bring forth recommendations. She noted that she was probably remiss at the last meeting for saying that in addition to the college senates, she also visited the student senate, and there was positive response to the university-wide proposal related to Capstone. The university wide perspective, in seeing it as an interdisciplinary approach, has been there from the original model. Implementation has been an issue.

Senator MacLin remarked that he appreciates what he has heard, that we should always try to figure out what the optimal formula is to get the students out in the real world. His concern is that there are these looming timelines. What this Capstone issue clearly needs is discussion and input. If we vote to terminate Capstone, there is still another opportunity to reinstate it with a new, improved proposal. This also might give us the opportunity to take it back and make it what we want. It is on our agenda to deal with.

Senator Swan responded that that is confusing to him, especially in light of Senator van Wormer's co-sponsorship of the motion. The motion is to drop Capstone. It is not to drop Capstone and then re-institute it later on. Voting to drop Capstone seems to mean that further discussions will be altered; we will not be discussing alterations to Capstone but will be deciding that Capstone as the concept is something we don't want. This is the clear, simple motion in front of us. In talking, it sometimes becomes unclear but the motion is very clear, if we drop Capstone, we drop Capstone as a concept. If we want to do something else then we should amend the motion.

Senator O'Kane noted that the motion is to drop Capstone as a university requirement.

The Provost remarked that in dropping Capstone as a university requirement there is no sense in coming back and looking at the LAC proposal that includes a Capstone-type of offering. It seems that people want to talk about Capstone as no Capstone, a modified Capstone, or the proposed Capstone. Depending on how the voting goes, one college might then be relieved of some of its burden to help populate a modified Capstone. You can modify Capstone and not reduce the Social Sciences and not reduce the Core. The two themes are not mutually exclusive and that's why this conversation is difficult. You can modify Capstone to allow for an expanded Capstone without any change to SBS. The change in the Social Science category allows you to move courses or resources to populate a newly expanded Capstone.

Senator Swan moved to call the question; second by Senator Romanin. Motion passed with 11 voting yes, a two-thirds majority. Motion to eliminate Capstone was defeated with five voting yes, nine voting no.

Consideration of Motion calling for further discussion of LAC proposals

This motion was made by Senator Swan at the end of the 3/08/04 meeting.

He noted that by making this motion he was hoping to signal to the university community the degree of serious intensity of these proposals. Agendas are published so the university community knows when votes will be taken, when discussions will be; it is very good to have it clear on our agendas what the Senate is actually doing. By passing this proposal, we are saying that we are going to discuss the LACC proposals further at this given meeting, but there will not be a vote. This motion, to discuss further the LACC proposals without voting on them, was seconded by Senator MacLin.

Senator Chancey clarified that by voting yes on this motion we are voting to discuss only and not to take any action, and by voting no we are voting that this might not be the outcome.

Senator Swan added that the reason this motion was made was so that it could be advertised to the campus community.

Senator Zaman questioned if this was an appropriate motion. Chair Heston responded that it was.

Senator Herndon remarked that the curriculum proposals may need to come before the Senate today and that by voting yes, that means we will be continuing this discussion today. If we vote it down, does that mean we cannot have the discussion?

Senator Swan responded that the next item on the agenda is the consideration of the LACC Proposals. We will be considering the LACC Proposals further, according to our agenda, and if we pass this motion we are saying that we will not vote on the LACC proposals. If we do not pass this motion, we are saying that we will discuss the LACC proposals and we may pass them.

Chair Heston reminded the Senate that there are only a few minutes left before we need to move on. She noted that she's not certain that if we vote on this we will have time for the discussion of the LACC Proposals.

Senator MacLin noted that he believed the spirit of this is that this is a better way to communicate to our constituents what we are and are not doing so they can prepare to be here. If it's not listed as an action item we shouldn't vote on it, and if it's listed as an action item we should vote on it.

In light of the time constraints, Provost Podolefsky suggested we decide if and when we will actually discuss it and vote on it rather than just saying we will discuss it later.

Senator Swan responded that that is a very good suggestion and suggested the following friendly amendment; that the Senate continue discussing the LACC Proposals at the next meeting without voting on them. Senator MacLin who had seconded the motion agreed.

Senator Wurtz asked Senator Swan when he would suggest the Senate give themselves permission to vote on this. Senator Swan responded that when all the senators and all the faculty feel that we have discussed at length and completely all of the issues of a complex curriculum. He commented that at the last meeting the discussion was very worthwhile, and after such a meaningful discussion we would feel comfortable voting.

Chair Heston asked Senator Swan if he would amend his motion to plan on a discussion for 4/12/04 with voting on 4/26/04, barring unforeseen

circumstances. Senator Swan responded ?no? as he is reading the sense of the senate and he thinks the senate should do what it wants.

Provost Podolefsky asked for clarification as to the number meetings that remain. Chair Heston responded that there only two, April 12 and April 26, with a MA proposal on Philanthropy coming forward on 4/12 from HPELS and the Graduate College, a report from the English Department about the ACT waiver that is scheduled to expire, and there are a couple of things that have been docketed and not dealt with, as well as the usual end of the year of reports.

Senator MacLin reminded Chair Heston that there is already a motion on the floor. He noted that he thinks it is important to talk about this but the sense is that it does not have to be done this week or next. The Senate needs to create the sense that we are involved in the deliberation process of this and the examination of information regarding this proposal. We need to not let people perceive that we are rushing this thing.

Chair Heston reminded the senate that the minutes from this meeting will not go out for another week, which will be approved at the 4/12/04 meeting and then distributed to the faculty. If we were to vote at the 4/26/04 meeting, that would create a great deal of difficulty for the faculty if they wish to appeal a decision as the minutes from the 4/26/04 meeting will not actually be approved until September, and then will be distributed. Approval for the publication deadline would have to be done today.

Senator Swan commented that the faculty at-large can appeal in September whatever the Senate approves on the 26th.

Senator Chancey stated that Senator's Swan motion has in effect tied the hands of the Senate on this proposal. Because of that, he will be voting against this motion. We cannot expect, as a body, to constantly call people forth to give opinions if the Senate is not willing to set an agenda. In voting ?no?, he is voting that we publicly agree to vote ?yes? or ?no? on one part or another at the next meeting.

Senator Swan remarked that as a scheduling motion, an amendment to schedule a vote does contradict the motion.

Senator Wurtz moved to call the question; second by Senator Chancey. Motion passed.

Motion calling for further discussion only at the April 12, 2004 Faculty Senate failed, with it remaining on the agenda for the April 12, 2004 as a possible action item pending discussion.

Motion to put further discussion of the LACC Proposals on the agenda for the April 12, 2004 meeting for action after discussion by Senator Chancey; second by Senator Moore.

Senator Swan called for the orders of the day. Chair Heston responded that we will put this motion aside and return to it.

Consideration of Program Restatements

Associate Provost Koch stated that the next item for consideration is the final curriculum matter from the University Curriculum Committee

(UCC). She reminded the Senate that the final curriculum package was sent to the Senate with a cover letter dated 3/11/04. This is the final step in the curriculum review process for the year and involves approval of the program restatements only with a few additional items. The rest of the curriculum package has gone forward to the Board and these most recent changes are scheduled to be docketed for the April meeting. She noted that the purpose of elongating the curriculum process this year has been the result of concerns expressed by the Senate and the UCC about programs continuing to grow in length, and interest in whether the university can afford to offer longer and longer programs in light of the current and possible future budget constraints.

Dr. Koch noted that the UCC has done a tremendous job of going back to the table with departments, and the faculty in departments have really worked hard on this. The results of their hard work are before you, and given the mandate that they were given, they've done a good job, and she appreciates the efforts of the committee and the faculty in making this happen. She noted that eleven programs were reduced in length to become credit hour neutral, and they were approved as revised. They had all been longer prior to this revision. Three programs were revised and reduced, and nine programs that were tabled and then reconsidered actually do have some increase in hours ranging to one to six hours. In every case, program representatives including department heads came back to the UCC with what the committee felt were very strong reasons for the additional increase in hours, as well as explanations as to how they were going to cover any increased costs. The process has been very difficult and has lengthened the curriculum process this year; it also has been very effective and she recommends that the Senate approve these changes. She also acknowledged the personnel in the Registrar's Office who supported this extended process by moving their deadlines.

Senator Swan moved to approve with gratitude this proposal from the UCC on Program Restatements; second by Senator MacLin.

In response to Senator Herndon's question, Diane Wallace, Registrar's Office, noted that there were some prerequisites changes that had not been previously noted.

Motion passed with one abstention.

Consideration of Additional Graduate Curriculum Changes

Associate Dean Jacqueline McGlade, Graduate College, passed out informational sheets on the changes and pending new programs. All information needed on the new M.A. can be obtained by going to the Graduate College website, with a link to the Graduate College Curriculum Committee (GCCC). These were small changes that the Graduate Council wanted to make sure got through this semester.

Senator Chancey moved approval of the additional graduate curriculum changes omitting the M.A. in Philanthropy and Non-Profit Development that will come to the Senate at a later meeting; second by Senator Zaman. Motion passed.

The Senate moved to Executive Session to discuss the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence nominees.

Motion to accept the recommendations of the Regents Award for Faculty Excellence Committee by Senator Romanin; second by Senator Ogbondah.
Motion passed.

Resumption of discussion of Senator Chancey's motion asking for a vote at the April 12, 2004 meeting on the LACC Proposals.

Senator Chancey noted that his reason for making the motion is just a practical matter. To exercise our review process as the Senate we need to be clear to our university colleagues when we will take action.

Senator MacLin commented that he thought the Senate can be clear in a variety of ways, going beyond this issue to a procedure issue. If it is action, list it as action; if it is a discussion, list it as discussion. That way it is clear to the Senate what they're doing and it's streamlining our process. His concern is that it becomes an action item when the Senate feels everyone has talked the issue through. He noted that he has not gotten a final report on the LACC's recommendations; it's not clear what has been changed from each time it was presented. All the information is not there and he feels the Senate needs time to discuss this with their constituents.

Chair Heston responded that all the information that the LACC has prepared document-wise is posted on the web site. Senator MacLin replied that he is not looking for random information, he's looking for the document that supports the final recommendation, and the Senate has not been given this.

Chair Heston noted that there is some confusion. The documents that are on the Faculty Senate's web site are the final documents. We will not be provided with anything more unless we request it.

Senator MacLin replied that he likes being able to "tinker" and not having our hands tied. If we force ourselves to put this up as an action item we forcing ourselves to approve it.

Senator Chancey remarked that there is nothing to say that the Senate might not "tinker" with this next year. There are no deadlines as far as the Senate requesting changes, but in terms of printing deadlines, those have already passed.

Senator Zaman questioned Senator Swan's concern about wide dissemination, noting that that was the charge the Senate gave the LACC. When they visited the college senates about the proposals, they had done their job, they did what we charged them to. It is now up to this body, the Senate, to look at the proposal and decide if it is something we can live with.

Senator Bankston commented that there seemed to be concern when discussing an earlier motion that the Senate would error by tying the Senate's hands and possibly losing some flexibility. In many ways this motion seems to do the same thing but in the opposite direction. He would hate to think that at the next meeting the Senate has that some issues come forward and that the Senate then begins to really discuss them and then we leave frustrated because a vote had to occur. He hopes that we could have the vote, as it seems we are very close to doing that.

Senator Wurtz suggested that the Senate follow the natural order of our

tasks rather than predetermining them, and stop looking for perfection, as we will not find it. Let's go with what we've got; it was put together by people making a good faith effort. Things can always be fixed later.

In response to Senator Bankston, Senator Zaman noted that he is not for any kind of censoring but his concern is that if we keep this open ended we will never resolve it. If there is a concern later on, then we can address it later on.

Senator Swan noted that we do have a LAC right now and the Senate does not have to do anything. If we think we should do something just to be doing something, that's not a good reason. He does like a lot of the proposals but he wants to hear more about them. If we could get it right now at this juncture, ok, but we don't have to because we do have a program in place. We can just receive the report, which would be an action. He might not be opposed to a motion to schedule a vote but he doesn't know if it is necessary.

Senator Couch Breitbach stated that the proposals and the work of the LACC come from the Category Reviews. They are being driven by data that is collected in a very systemic and organized way.

Senator Wurtz commented that it appears as though the Senators' love the sound of their own voices. These people, the LACC, did a job and we are insulting them.

Senator Zaman noted that the LACC was charged by this body, the Faculty Senate, two years ago to come up with this proposal. They have done that and we have had discussions, and now it is time we took action. The action could be that we don't like the proposals but let's just take an action.

Senator MacLin remarked that he likes the discussion because it helps him understand who we are. His experience with committees is that once the committee makes a decision they pretty well stick with it for some time because it is a long and painful process. He noted that he appreciates the feedback and that we need to be careful about how we perceive our selves and our process to our constituents. We have in the past called people to the carpet because of a suspected foul process. The people that will do that to us are our constituents and there is a sense that this thing is coming down fast and a sense that just because a proposal came up the Senate will move forward with it. We have an obligation to stick with the process, and let's error on the side of going too slow.

Provost Podolefsky stated that he doesn't disagree with Senator MacLin because process is important. The process began a couple of years ago, and then new senators came on and they were unaware of what started the process. If this goes into the summer some portion of this Senate will change over and we will have new people asking why we are doing this. What he is sensing is that this current proposal has been out since November and it is now time to talk about the proposal itself. But after two years, to go through another summer and then come back for more discussion, we need to get on with the business.

Senator Swan remarked that that is exactly what he thinks, discussing at the next meeting without anyone being forced to vote when they're not ready. This motion is respecting our colleagues on the LACC by engaging their proposals and working with them. At times we don't show respect

for our colleagues by not discussing things through. We really need to get to the discussion.

Chair Heston stated that the Senate could have a special meeting just on this issue in a bigger room with it being open to the faculty.

The motion by Dr. Cooper to extend the Senate meeting for ten minutes was passed with one opposed.

Senator Zaman responded that he liked Chair Heston's idea of a special meeting and since there's so much interest in this, to have it for three hours just focusing on this, but at some point in time he would like to have some kind of action.

The Provost recommended that the next meeting be extended for an hour, and if there is a motion and two-thirds feel so, vote on the question.

Senator Chancey clarified his motion, noting that it be listed as action on the agenda. Whatever the Senate wishes to do, whether it is to table it, to call the question, it is simply as a courtesy to our colleagues.

Senator Swan commented that that is helpful to know.

It was agreed to schedule the next meeting, April 12, for extra time and address this item only. It was suggested that refreshments be provided.

Senator Swan made a friendly amendment that the LACC Proposals be listed as an action item on the agenda and to extend the meeting by one hour to 6:00 P.M. This was agreed to by Senator Chancey.

Motion to call the question by Senator Swan; second by Senator Moore.
Motion passed.

Motion to dedicate an extended Senate meeting on Apr. 12 to discussion and possible action on the LAC proposal passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn by Senator Zaman; second by Senator _____.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted by,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary